DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 837 SP 028 766

AUTHOR Butler, E. Dean
TITLE Mentor Perceptions of Mentoring and Internships in MAT and Lyndhurst Programs--Cycle I.
INSTITUTION Memphis State Univ., TN. Center of Excellence in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE 24 Nov 86
NOTE 69p.; For related documents, see SP 028 767-768.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Higher Education; *Internship Programs; *Masters Degrees; *Mentors; Participant Satisfaction; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Program Length; *Student Teaching; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS *Extended Degree Programs; Lyndhurst Fellowship Program

ABSTRACT

This study collected and analyzed data appropriate for documenting the implementation of two programs in teacher education at Memphis State University--the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program, and the Lyndhurst Fellowships, a one-year program for certifying teachers for secondary schools. Qualitative data were obtained through semi-structured interviews with mentors serving in the two programs, and from a questionnaire designed to yield both quantitative and qualitative data. Both classroom teachers and university faculty functioned as mentors for student teacher interns in the MAT program, and for interns preparing for secondary certification in the Lyndhurst program. Descriptions are given of the characteristics, responsibilities, and activities of classroom and pedagogical mentors in both programs. Their perceptions of the effectiveness of their efforts, the problems they faced, and their relationships with the interns they worked with are described and interpreted in the light of the inherent strengths and weaknesses of the programs. Mentor ratings of each program are presented, and the findings are analyzed. Tables display comparative data from the responses of mentors in each program to questions on the mentor's role, perceptions of the internships, mentoring activities, and personal characteristics of classroom and pedagogical mentors. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED280837

# Mentor Perceptions of Mentoring and Internships

## In MAT and Lyndhurst Programs - Cycle I

November 24, 1987

Prepared by E. Dean Butler

Center of Excellence in Teacher Education

College of Education

Memphis State University

Memphis, TN 38152

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. D. Butler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP 028 766

Table of Contents


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Introduction . . . . . | 1 |
| Master of Arts Program . . . . . | 3 |
| Classroom-Mentors | 3 |
| Pedagogical-Mentors | 8 |
| MAT Internships | 12 |
| Findings | 23 |
| Mentor Ratings of MAT Program Features . . . | 26 |
| Lyndhurst Program . . . . . | 27 |
| Classroom Mentors | 27 |
| Pedagogical Mentors | 34 |
| Arts and Science Mentors | 39 |
| Internship Activities | 44 |
| Mentor Ratings of Lyndhurst Program Components | 47 |
| Findings | 48 |
| Tables . . . . . | 52-66 |

## Introduction

The study of mentor support systems and internship experiences of the MAT and Lyndhurst programs was conceptualized and conducted within the framework of the comprehensive design developed to evaluate 1985-86 programs of the Center of Excellence in Teacher Education, College of Education, Memphis State University. The basic purpose of the study was to collect and analyze data appropriate for documenting the implementation of two components of the five-year programs in teacher education. A secondary purpose was to field test data collection strategies which might be refined for use in future evaluative inquiries.

Two types of data were collected. Qualitative data were obtained through semi-structured interviews with all persons serving as mentors in the two programs during the latter part of the academic year (April and May) and through the use of a questionnaire designed to yield both quantitative and qualitative data. The questionnaire was designed in April, 1985 and administered in May and June. The questionnaires were sent to the mentors, both public school teachers and university faculty, with instructions to complete them prior to the scheduled interviews. The interviews, conducted by two members of the college staff, solicited information relative to problems in responding to the instrument, obtained suggestions regarding additional items, and collected perceptions of the program, especially relating to mentoring and the internships and suggestions for improvement. All the classroom teacher-mentors interviews were conducted during May and June, 1986. Most university mentors were also interviewed during this time with two conducted later in the summer.

The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed into protocols analyzed through the use of pre-established categories or major themes used in providing structure for the interview. Emergent categories were also noted as they were generated in the interviews. Through the use of color coding the interview data were compiled by categories which facilitated additional analyses. The

quantitative data yielded by the questionnaire were coded for computer analysis performed on a mainframe computer at the university.

Data presented and summarized are primarily descriptive with some effort made to construct "rich or thick" descriptions in order to better convey the perceptual realities expressed by program participants. Some preliminary explanatory, or theoretical generalization, are posited, especially in attempting to interpret variations noted in mentoring relationships analyzed. Constructs used in interpreting these relationships are found in Kram (1985) who has established two basic types of mentoring relationships: psychosocial and career-related. The psychosocial function, associated with professional effectiveness, identity with self and significant others, and personal feelings of competence is manifested through role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling and friendship. Emotional bonding is an important feature of this type. Relationships which facilitate understanding of the organizations (learning the ropes) and advancement therein, include roles relating to protection, sponsorship, coaching, exposure-and-visibility, and providing opportunities for challenging assignments. No attempt was made to systematically analyze and interpret all the mentoring relationships found in Cycle I of the two programs though some of the more apparent ones are reported, based largely on the Kram's conceptualizations.

*Kram, K.E. (1985). Mentoring at work. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Co.

## Classroom Mentors

Description of the classroom-mentors. Thirteen teachers served as classroom mentors in Cycle I, 1985-86, school year for the MAT programs including one who also was a mentor in the Lyndhurst program. The group consisted of 3 males and 7 females. In terms of classroom teaching experience, 4 had more than 21 years of experience. They held positions in two urban/suburban school systems with 9 in senior high schools and 4 in junior high or middle schools. Twelve had previous experience working with student teachers with 3 reporting they had worked with 7 or more. Their subject field specializations included mathematics (2), social sciences (2), English (7), Science (1), foreign language (1) and various combinations (3). All had Level II or III status in the Career Ladder program and several commented in the interviews that they thought they had been selected as mentors because of this. Some responded that their principals had often asked them in the past to assist new teachers in the schools or to work with student teachers. Thus numerous factors appear to have functioned in their selection, including willingness to participate, class schedules, subject area specializations, school administrator decisions in concert with college representatives, career ladder status, and previous professional roles in working with other teachers or with student teachers.

As initially designed, and as implemented in most school sites, these mentors were to work with the MAT interns assigned to them for six weeks of student teaching during the 1985 fall semester with interns remaining in these sites until the school year ended unless developments necessitated a change. At the beginning of the 1986 spring semester interns were to assume full responsibility as teacher-of-record for two of the classes in which they had served as student teachers. Most internships followed this plan. Mentors active at the conclusion of the 1986 spring semester were the ones interviewed and were requested to

complete the questionnaire. Thus most mentors who participated in the data collection activities had worked with the interns since the 1985 fall semester. Where interns had been relocated in new sites or with new mentors, data were not obtained from the original mentors with one exception. Also, one that had been asked to participate late in the semester also contributed information.

Role information. Mentors reported that initially they did not have adequate information about their roles and responsibilities and perceived the interns to also lack sufficient information about their assignments and what they would be doing. (See Table 1) The mentor-teachers were informed by their principals a short time, typically two or three days before the interns reported, that they would be having "student teachers." The principals apparently did not understand the new program, though some information had been distributed to them. One teacher reported, "they just showed up and we were nervous." One teacher said she was told on Wednesday that the student would be there on Monday, but she had no idea of the time period that would be involved. Much later she found out the student was expected to remain with her for the rest of the year. The intern reported that he would be with her until Christmas and would then be assigned elsewhere. Interview data constantly reflected that inadequate information regarding the MAT program, the internship responsibilities of the mentor and the intern was made available to mentors and principals during the early part of 1985 fall semester.

Intern activities during the six weeks of student teaching apparently was typical of those provided for undergraduate student teachers. Most of the mentors had supervised student teachers in the past and were aware of such programs. While no concerted effort was made to document the fall semester activities of the interns, some mentors provided information regarding these activities. During these initial placements, interns observed, assisted in various types of class activities, and taught for several days before the

semester ended. In several cases, mentors mentioned that they took back over the last week of the semester in order to prepare students for semester examinations.

More information about the program and the clinical experiences were provided during the 1986 spring semester by college personnel and through a workshop conducted on the university campus. Teachers attending this orientation workshop were positive about the information presented and felt they better understood what they were to be doing after that point in time. The workshop was scheduled during the day during the semester examination period in one school system and this prevented several teacher-mentors from attending. Their principals would not approve their absence from school. One teacher commented that "the workshop was excellent. They offered guidelines and suggestions and told us to do what we wanted with our interns. I was reassured that I could handle it." The mentors also stated that the pedagogical-mentors and program coordinator supplemented the college workshop by providing additional information and by working with them in designing the intern schedules for the spring semester.

Late in the semester a Tennessee State Department of Education career development workshop on mentoring was conducted on the university campus with many of the teacher-mentors in attendance. They were positive toward this workshop and felt that the information presented validated mentoring roles they had assumed.

Data obtained through the questionnaire indicated 8 of the mentors felt the information provided about their role and responsibilities was either excellent or good and 11 had similar perceptions of their understanding of mentoring as shown in Table 1. These responses were obtained near the end of the internships when they did possess extensive information about their roles. In terms of initial planning for the intern, only 4 noted it as excellent or good (see Table 2).

Mentor activities and relationships. Nineteen mentoring activities were presented in the questionnaire in a checklist format in order to solicit information from all mentoring groups about each group's mentoring activities (Table 3). These activities were developed from a review of the mentor literature and from understandings of the experiences normally associated with the induction of new teachers and responsibilities assumed by those professionals assisting in the process.

As shown by the frequencies reported in Table 3, 10 of the activities listed were marked as being associated with the role performances of all 13 mentors. These included various types of assistance with instruction, monitoring, sharing information about school practices and the nuances of schools, and serving as a model of exemplary instruction. Twelve of the mentors reported serving as advocates, confidants and counselors; introducing interns to others associated with the school; sharing information about upcoming events; and providing assistance as the interns prepared to participate in the state or system's evaluation of their teaching. Ten of the mentors held regular meetings with the interns and 2 assisted their interns with instructional technology, specifically microcomputers.

The interview data yielded similar information regarding mentor activities. The teachers mentioned advising, reacting to instructional plans, solving problems, suggesting alternative strategies, being a role model, ameliorating criticism or attack and providing support. Becoming friends was also noted by some. "We became more like friends..." one mentor said, "I was kind of aloof and it was kind-of-like a teacher-student relationship but once I found out that she could handle the situation, that she was what I would consider pretty competent, we became more like peers." This same mentor took considerable pride in the manner in which she coached the intern in planning for, and succeeding in, the system's evaluation process.

Successful mentor personnel characteristics suggested by mentors was understanding and accepting the individuality of the intern, flexibility, openness, and sharing with the interns. The sharing perspective was stated by one as, "I had experience and I had a lot of knowledge that I was willing to share and I did share it whenever it was applicable."

Perserverance was a personal characteristic not on the checklist emphasized by one mentor whose intern lacked self-confidence and assertiveness and who initially challenged the patience of the mentor. The mentor reported being grateful that she had perservered and had witnessed remarkable development of the intern into a competent teacher. Another mentor emphasized the "importance of expressing confidence in the intern, letting them know that they are competent and fully capable of performing well the teaching role. Psycho-social mentor functions associated with successful mentoring are clearly present in these observations.

In the course of the interviews, several mentors reported awareness of how relationships with their interns became more positive and supportive over the extended period of the internship. Only one mentor articulated that no change in the relationship was apparent, reporting that he "sought to come up with some kind of answer to show that it did change" and concluded that it didn't change. I gave advice and made suggestions as I thought necessary." This was the relationship.

Other comments made relative to the changes in the mentoring relations included:

- We have become a good teaching team.
- We moved from teacher-student roles to teacher-teacher roles.
- She was my professional partner, now she is a personal friend.
- More trust developed.
- The intern came to better accept my role as one which was

supportive rather than critical

- Each of us progressed to the proint where mutual cooperation was present.

While some mentors reported that relationships evolved toward being more trustful, open, supportive, and beneficial to both, some obviously did not. Though they functioned initially their development over time resulted in a distant or strained relationship with little or no contact being maintained.

Numerous personality factors, along with school content factors, apparently contributed to the deterioration of some relationships. For example, in one case the relationship became unproductive as "the intern became more resistant to my suggestions as the school year progressed." Mentor role performance problems creating this intern resistence was not documented though inadequacy as a professional role model, as perceived by the intern, may be a contributing factor.

Pedagogical Mentors

College of Education faculty members had responsibilities for coordinating internship roles and activities in the MAT program and were identified as education or pedagogical mentors. While there were other College of Education faculty members who served as content-area mentors in some phases of the MAT program, these faculty members were not active during the latter weeks of the 1986 spring semester when the data were collected and no data were obtained from them. Also, their roles had been specifically task related earlier in the year and their responsibilities did not involve extended introduction with the interns during the internship.

Pedagogical-mentor data reported are primarily perceptions obtained through the semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire yielded some quantitative data, summarized in various tables, and also some written comments which are incorporated into the report.

The pedagogical-mentors were to facilitate induction of MAT interns into their roles as classroom teachers and to insure that appropriate evaluative information about intern responsibilities and activities was collected and returned to the program coordinator. Their roles as mentors had begun during the first summer of the program when they provided direction for small mentoring groups, maintained throughout the program. Coordinating roles began in the fall of 1985 when the interns were assigned to school sites for the first mini-experiences.

The design of the MAT mentor support systems incorporated the use of education generalists and was founded on a developmental-theoretical structure through which individual intern socialization into teacher roles could be carefully monitored and maximized. This perspective was valued as critical since the interns were essentially being provided with the same types of information regarding professional functions of teaching and were being paced together through the same teacher preparation curriculum. Also, they were being asked to perform similar roles in the internship placements. The generalists orientation the college faculty brought to the mentor role was incorporated since it was believed the approach overcame some of the limitations and narrow perspectives of schooling and teaching associated with different specializations within the field of professional education.

Staff conferencing and a rotational supervision strategies incorporated into the MAT mentoring system were viewed positively by the MAT pedagogical mentors. Through staffing all interns, which included observing, coaching and assessment, along with "swat team" problem identification, all mentors could contribute their expertise in identifying strategies which might maximize the development of each intern. The staffing function complimented individual mentoring and was continued throughout the academic year.

Pedagogical mentoring support, while focusing on coordinating intern

activities in the schools, entailed various responsibilities. In addition to monitoring and supervising, the mentors planned with the classroom mentors and school administrators activities of the internships. They also provided role and program information to the school officials and assisted the interns in several ways, including planning and implementing instruction, suggesting classroom management strategies, advising interns about potential problems, serving as a confidant, counselor, protector and advocate, sharing nuances about the schools and school systems; and assisting the interns in understanding the school system's evaluation processes. (See Table 4). Other mentor activities reported by one or two of the college faculty involved included assisting in locating and using instructional resources, being an instructional model, helping solve personal problems, introducing interns to others, and sharing knowledge about school systems' policies and practices.

The pedagogical-mentor role was defined as labor-intensive; resulting largely from the amount of time involved with supervising, monitoring and coordinating intern experiences in the school sites. Their presence in the school sites was clearly validated by data obtained from the classroom mentors who worked with these college representatives. Classroom mentors also acknowledged the importance of the education mentors' contributions to the successful design and implementation of internship experiences and, in a few cases, recognized the important role they had performed in coaching them to grow in the role of mentoring the novice teacher.

One feature of pedagogical-mentoring support systems implemented in Cycle I which should be noted involved two mentors having administrative responsibilities for coordinating and directing the program. These joint assignments were intentional and were viewed positively since the program administrators came to better understand the role performance of mentoring, a new formal role designation in the college, and the processes of guiding the interns through the

early induction phases of becoming a teacher. However, in some instances, role conflicts did merge. While no special problems were reported as a result of the mentors having dual role responsibilities, the concern was associated with how it might affect mentorship responsibilities.

The development of the formal role of pedagogical mentoring in the MAT program was supported by all three faculty members who assumed that role in Cycle I. They also viewed the creation of the role for college faculty as timely since it complimented mentoring incorporated in the Career Ladder Plan for teachers in Tennessee. While Cycle I mentor role performances appeared to be structured largely in terms of established responsibilities and activities associated with supervising student teachers, as one mentor noted, the name of mentor implied change. Thus the use of this term to identify those who have special skills, competencies, and understandings appropriate for guiding novice teachers through the initial induction into professional responsibilities and activities was viewed positively. Also, as the mentor role continues to be performed, analyzed, refined, and evaluated, mentor role development could become an important outcome of the MAT program.

As shown in Table 5 the pedagogical mentors were unanimous in validating 14 of the 19 personal characteristics listed as being associated with successful mentoring. These data support those characteristics identified by the classroom mentors as desirable if one wishes to engage in effective mentoring.

MAT education mentors were positive toward the roles classroom mentors had assumed in the program and for the support they had provided the interns. They did not question the school site selections and most of the intern-mentor pairings in the schools were also supported.

No substantial variations in educator-mentor role performances were noted for those serving in Cycle I. All were aware of their responsibilities and enthusiastic in their roles. Flexibility in role performances among all three

was noted; reflected in the manner they sought to provide the interns with differentiated resources, including mentor attentiveness and time. A distinguishing feature of their roles, when compared with those of the classroom teacher mentors, was associated with the coordinating functions they performed. Since all performed as managers, as well as mentors, their roles in the program were complex and thus difficult to assess within the role conceptualizations normally associated with mentoring.

MAT Internships

MAT internship sites were identified jointly by college representatives and school system personnel with intern preferences, and travel of the interns to and from the sites also being factors considered. The initial placements for student teaching experiences in the fall semester were also to serve as sites for the teacher-of-record experiences in the 1986 spring semester. It was initially recognized that some changes in placement sites might be needed and they were.

College representatives had requested that classroom teachers holding career level II or III status be identified in these schools as mentors for the interns. Teaching assignments, both class loads and content, were also a factor used in identifying the mentors but career ladder status was the important criterion. School system personnel, either these in the central offices or the school principals were responsible for identifying the classroom mentors. Through the pool of Level II or III teachers was small, all teachers identified as mentors were Level II or III and most were teaching classes for which their interns had adequate content preparation. As designed, these mentors were to work with the intern through the rest of the school year, assuming no major problems emerged.

Teacher-of-record. The purpose and design of the MAT teacher-of-record experiences were clearly understood and implemented. All interns assumed full responsibility for two classes including two different preparations at the beginning of the 1986 spring semester. School administrators and teacher-mentors

clearly understood this feature of the internship and well-thought out plans involving classroom mentors, interns, pedagogical-mentors, and principals were evident. Though some changes in assignments were necessary, all interns were assumed full responsibilities for teaching at least two classes for all or most of the entire semester. Variations detected in the teacher-of-record experiences resulted mostly from the way classroom-mentors functioned in their roles.

The teacher-mentors reflected diverse patterns of observing and interrelating with the interns once they began to teach. Some mentors conducted regular planning sessions with the interns and reviewed weekly, or more often, lesson plans, discussed instructional strategies, reviewed tests, and jointly analyzed problem areas. Others had interactions on a less formal basis and met with the intern when requested or when some problem needed to be resolved. Monitoring of the interns' teaching varied from periodic observation and monitoring, with some remaining in the interns' classes for several days initially, to almost complete abandonment from the beginning. Some mentors turned over classrooms in January and engaged in minimum observation, or none at all, during the rest of the semester. Also, some teacher-mentors were hesitant to turn over their classes even though they fully understood by the spring semester that this was to be done. Some took them back over, or became more visible to their students for a period of time before they eventually gave complete control to the interns. One mentor refused to give up the classes and instructional groups had to be formed from intact classes in the school.

Varying perceptions of the teacher-mentors existed in relation to how they should function with their interns in regard to assisting with instruction. The following observations reflect this diversity:

> "When she started teaching I told her, 'I'm not going to interfere unless you ask.'"
>
> "I tried not to overreact--tried to let him work out things on his own. I

was hesitant to make suggestions unless there was a serious problem developing and then I tried to focus only on things of major importance."

"I don't mind them taking over two classes. I turned them over completely to her at the semester break. Someone asked her what her mentor said when he observed and she told them I hadn't been observing. I didn't."

"After three weeks I was ready to give up. I wanted her out. After talking with the college folks I agreed to let her stay, and I told her that I was going to remove myself from the classroom for two weeks and that I didn't want to know what was going on. Don't tell me a problem. For two weeks they are yours. Toward the end of the two weeks she confided that she was losing ground and I came back in and we plotted strategy together."

"I was not the original mentor. I treated her like other student teachers I had had. He (college mentor) caught me after school and said I would be having a student teacher and that's the way I understood it to be."

"I stayed in the room a lot; then gradually I started leaving. I would leave for a few minutes and then come back. At times I would stay away half of the period or I wouldn't be there when the period started. Gradually, I stayed away the whole period."

"I wasn't in there observing that much. I did observe the first semester when she was a practice teacher, I guess you could call it that. When she took over, of course, it was different... She never came to me with any problems she had in the classroom. She handled them herself, which is a plus for her."

"In January we had a really hard time swapping our roles. Look at this room. Two people can't work in here and I resented having another person in here sharing my desk and my materials. Nothing was where I had left it."

"I refused to give up any of my classes so what she ended up with classes created from overflow of other classes. I don't think I would do that again. I would give up one."

"I was not going to leave her alone. I had a bad experience with one student teacher that, in fact, I left alone too soon and too abruptly. I said I would never do that again."

Cooperative teaching. All interns were expected to be in the school sites all day and to have two periods of cooperative teaching and two periods of planning in addition to the two periods of being teacher-of-record. The two periods of cooperative teaching arrangements were difficult to document though the data obtained indicate the arrangements varied greatly among the intern placements. Some interns were closely engaged with their mentors during these periods, assisting with instruction, participating in planning and material

development, observing, tutoring individual students or directing group work. Other interns apparently had little opportunity to do much other than observe, grade papers, and run off tests. More than one mentor observed that the interns had so much to do to prepare for their own classes, and for their courses at the university, that they did not have time to be involved actively in the teacher's classes. One intern, it is known, became actively involved in a third class and eventually took over this class before the semester ended.

In that the cooperative teaching experience was not well-defined, as reported by several of the mentors, they felt free to handle this as they saw fit. Thus some interns remained as assistants or aides while others were able to function as members of a teaching team involving cooperative planning and sharing of instructional responsibilities. In several instances where grade levels and subject matter permitted, interns were able to watch their mentor-teacher teach material one period that they taught later in the day.

Uncertainty was associated with the intent and design of the cooperative teaching activities at the beginning of the semester and, for many, remained so until the end. As one mentor reflected, "I don't know if I did it right; how I used her in the two periods with me."

Though documentation of the cooperative teaching component is weak, it is obvious that this component was not assigned priority once the intern began teaching two classes and it appeared that some interns did not engage in this activity throughout the duration of the internship.

Joint planning. Mentor and intern joint planning for the interns' classes varied extensively with three distinct patterns reflected. In some cases, interns and mentors remained in almost constant contact, planning together before school and periodically during the day. They reviewed lesson plans and tests, and discussed possible problem solutions and pupil management techniques. Another pattern consisted of intern-mentor reationships where no joint planning

occurred and the intern never sought the advice or suggestion of the mentor. Apparently some review of lesson planning was done though documentation of this was difficult. These mentors intervened only if they perceived problems were approaching a crisis level. A middle-of-the-road pattern involved where occasional contact was made and the mentor monitored the intern activities at a distance and offered assistance that might be needed. Interns appeared to seek advice and suggestions from these mentors and eventually progressed to the point of telling them what they planned to do rather than asking them if a given approach might be appropriate.

Other intern activities. Interns were expected to participate in the school system's career ladder evaluation as apprentice teachers and mentors were to assist in this preparation. Most mentors served this function and were apparently a major source of support and information. Several mentors expressed great personal interest in the evaluative reports completed on their interns. Some interns apparently needed little assistance in this and thus their mentors had little, if any, involvement.

All interns were reported to have observed their mentors and other teachers in instructional roles and several (n=9) arranged to attend faculty meetings (Table 6). Five interns became affiliated with extracurricular activities and participated in school field trips and evening or weekend programs. Parent conferences were also scheduled by some. A few interns participated in school field trips and 8 attended evening or weekend school sponsored programs. Parent conferences were also scheduled by some (n=8). Nine interns assisted with homeroom responsibilities. Some mentors indicated they did not know the interns were expected to have these experiences. Thus mentor arranging for the experiences was apparently a critical factor in the interns having opportunities to participate in them.

Classroom-mentor perceptions of the internships. Interview data as well as

questionnaire data revealed generally positive support for the program, mentoring and the internships through some negative perceptions were reported. Summarized here are data obtained from the classroom-mentors regarding the interns and internship experiences, perceptions of the MAT college (pedagogical) mentors, and general reactions to their experiences as mentors. Data pertaining to various features of the MAT program are summarized in Table 7.

Teacher-mentor perceptions, obtained via questionnaire, of the total MAT program and its features (summarized in Table 2) indicate that mentors held the internship in high regard, i.e., view it excellent or good. Mentor group mean responses to the internship subscale indicate their belief in its value to the teaching profession. It was well accepted by the school faculties and administrators and was of value to school program and the school system. Initial planning for the interns received less positive responses.

Interview data indicate that the mentors support the idea of the extended time period of the internship which permits interns to obtain a "true picture of what teaching is" as compared with regular student teaching. The extended period also provided time, several reported, for the interns to be accepted by the students as "real teachers." One mentor reported that this takes at least six weeks.

The teacher-of-record feature of the internships was strongly supported by most mentors. Having full responsibility for two classes meant they had to assume teacher roles. Other professionals, as well as students, came to view them as teachers, thus facilitating induction into the role of teachers. They also had to be responsible for planning and implementing instruction with assistance sought as needed. The length of the internships afforded opportunities for mentors to observe development occur in their intern. Several noted how they saw their interns improve, gain confidence and assertiveness, and attain skills in handling students. One mentor remarked that the intern truly

became aware of "how we compromise, what the trade-offs are; saw how to make trade-offs; get the children to come around. I don't think she's afraid of any kind of problem now."

Some negative reactions toward the internships were reported. One was hesitancy in allowing an intern to take over advanced courses due to the mentor's perceptions of the intern's lack of qualification and experience. Some registered concern for their students whom they did not think would be served well by the intern's teaching. One mentor observed "that they should not take over a teacher's class at mid-semester; they need to start with new student groups that have not been associated with another teacher." "Students don't care for student teachers and especially for the whole semester. I'm very leary about that" was another response. In one school, students and some parents were reported to have resented the intern taking over. The students had enrolled in the class to have a particular teacher and became bitter, according to the mentor. She commented that this is not fair to the new teacher, the intern. In the case where a class was created for an intern, the class was viewed as "an undesirable one, worse than you would get as a beginning teacher. I don't think that most experienced teachers could cope with that." Another noted that the students had felt abandoned at first, but as the semester progressed, students accepted the intern and they would pass their former teacher in the hall and not give her a second look. Thus, the students came to claim ownership with the intern as teacher and became comfortable with that.

One mentor was concerned that interns were not in the classrooms the first day of school when roles are set and patterns relating to discipline and patterns of interactions established. Intern exhaustion level and the demands of the heavy workload of teaching and university courses on the intern were also reported. "You can try to cram too much in" and "I'm not sure all those things they were expected to do were worthwhile" reflect other negative perceptions.

Teacher-mentor perceived intern inadequacies focused primarily on weaknesses in instructional methods, communication skills, and classroom management techniques. "They did not get a good foundation in methods. They had some good simulations on classroom management but that's not the same as strategies for teaching classes" reported one teacher. Another suggested that secondary level teachers be used in teaching them methods before they begin the internships. Poor speaking skills were also reported by more than one mentor.

The coordinating function of the college mentors, along with their monitoring and coaching of the interns, and problem solving with the classroom teachers were viewed as excellent by most teacher-mentors. One noted "they're like lab rats, out here constantly. The college kept track of them very well." They were highly visible. One teacher reported how impressed she was with the college mentors, noting that they "demonstrated understanding of what the teacher's role really is, not 'pie in the sky,' nor merely philosophy, but a real down-to-earth grasp of what a teacher needs to be when she is standing in front of a classroom teaching." She noted that the university people were "very knowledgeable" and that they "demonstrated that knowledge in every aspect of my dealings with them." A less positive view of the college mentors was stated by one mentor, seeing them as having "an ivory tower kind of feel" when she talked with them. This mentor also saw the program as having "too much emphasis on theory and not enough practice."

When asked about their interest in serving again as mentor for the MAT program, 9 indicated strong interest. One had some interest, and 2 stated they had no interest. One claimed that the program made "me aware teachers have to start to assume some responsibility for what's coming into the classroom." Another reported that the intern "was a big help to her. It allowed me to plan more," and one saw the mentor role in terms of a reward. "She took two of my classes. That's worth a lot of money. It was a big reward for me. I loved it."

According to one mentor, the experience was "one of the most enjoyable experiences you'll ever have as a teacher. I have seen somebody that I thought was truly mediocre turn into a teacher that's better than ninety percent of those teaching. It has taken six months, but I will be proud that she taught under me."

Pedagogical-mentor perceptions of the internships. Material presented here is based on the data obtained from the college faculty who served as pedagogical mentors for Cycle I. As shown in Table 3, the MAT education mentor confirmed that the interns participated in various activities during the internships. One apparent discrepancy is reflected in the data reporting that the interns observed teachers other than the mentors. All the classroom mentors reported that their interns observed other teachers. One of the education mentors did not report this. Another difference relates to intern involvement in professional meetings. It is possible that the two groups of mentors did not have access to the same information about intern participation.

In most cases, as planned, the mentors successfully guided the interns in their student teaching roles in the fall semester and then turned over two of the classes to the intern at the beginning of the 1986 spring term, with careful monitoring and coaching of the intern being provided by the mentor. Pedagogical mentors were very pleased with some of the pairing reflected paradigm-type novice-expert mentoring relationships with both psycho-social and career-related functions present. These are reported elsewhere and substantiated by the education mentor who observed these relationships as they evolved and who assisted in their development.

In some cases the internships remained in the original sites though adjustments had to be made in order to secure classes of students for the interns. Some classroom mentors, as reported by the education-mentors and supported by interview data obtained from the classroom mentors, had difficulty

with the mentor role and intern assignments, refusing to give their classes, or remaining in control even when the interns were allowed to take over. This control was accomplished through continued presence in the classroom or through carefully planned monitoring, intervening or directing of the intern. The extreme was removing themselves immediately from both intern and students.

Where interns and mentors were not compatible in terms of philosophy, teaching style or personality, and new placements within the school site did not seem appropriate or practical, new site placements were made and new teacher-mentors identified. Procedurally this was accomplished through joint decision-making involving school officials and college representative, i.e., education mentor and program coordinator. In one case the relocation of the intern late in the semester was guided by the intent to place the intern in a different setting where specified structured observation and classroom instructional activities could be provided. These were subsequently made available and clearly documented through interview data.

Education mentor generated data support the conclusion that various professional competencies and personality factors influence the mentoring functions a person may be able to perform. Holding Level II or III status is not, it was noted, by itself, a good indicator of mentor role potential. However, the use of Level II or III teachers is still valued and viewed as appropriate in future program cycles. Use of teachers holding such status, it is believed, facilitates mentor selection, negates some of the selection factors traditionally operating in school systems and school sites, and compliments the State of Tennessee's efforts in maximizing the professional development of public school teachers. As the pool of Level II and III teachers is increased, some of the problems associated with classroom mentoring in Cycle I of the MAT program should be reduced or better controlled. Also, as mentoring role development continues, and as successful mentoring role performances are documented,

providing productive classroom mentoring support systems appropriate for each intern should be better realized.

## Findings

### MAT Mentoring and Internships

Mentoring Support Systems.

1. Pedagogical mentoring, as an innovative role, achieved considerable success in facilitating individual intern progression through phases of the program in Cycle I with few inadequacies or failures noted.
2. Performance of the newly designed mentor role by college faculty reflected a role intensity and extensiveness which had not been experienced before, especially in facilitating the induction of novice teachers.
3. Mentor role development of college faculty designated as mentors in Cycle I was enhanced by the newness of the term, formally structured group mentoring, involvement in the programs as instructors, and through serving a small number of interns.
4. Performance of the mentor role by college faculty in Cycle I reflected extensive coordinating and managing responsibilities. The role also supported selected psycho-social and career-related needs of novice teachers.
5. Administrative use of staffing and sharing of mentoring/supervising responsibilities among the MAT mentor team was an innovative feature which served well the developmental needs of certain interns.
6. Teacher-mentors utilized during Cycle I demonstrated wide variations in the performance of mentoring functions. Major factors appearing to limit both career-related and psycho-social functions include over-protectiveness of their students, unncertainty about role performance, selected personality features, and lack of commitment to the program and the development of the interns.
7. College faculty serving as coordinating mentors achieved some success in facilitating mentor role development of the classroom teachers. One factor responsible for the lack of success noted may relate to this not having been

identified as a role expectation for the pedagogical-mentors. Personal and situational factors, it should be noted, were inhibiting factors also, along with the newest of the role.

8. Specifications of the various mentoring roles in Cycle I were late in being developed and/or communicated though understanding of the roles, especially those of the classroom teachers, was enhanced by the professional development program for teachers being implemented by the Department of Education, State of Tennessee.
9. Age, sex, and race were not mentoring variables analyzed in the study though these factors may have been critical in forming or inhibiting specific relationships, especially those involving cross-gender and bi-racial pairings.

Internships

1. School sites selected for Cycle I placements of the interns for the latter phases of induction into the teacher role were appropriate social-organizational contexts for novice teacher socialization. Sites used in the early phases were not assessed in this inquiry.
2. Inadequacies found in the internships did not relate to the school sites or students served, but resulted from personality factors of the individuals involved and mentoring role inadequacies of selected teachers.
3. School sites used in reassigning certain interns resulted in improved intern-mentor relationships and improved internship placements.
4. Major problems reported in the Cycle I internships were successfully resolved. Since the problems appeared to result from factors unique to each situation, no general pattern of contributing factors was noted.
5. While all interns completing the program moved progressively through the designated phases of the year long internship, the contributions made by the different phases, especially the early ones and some components of the latter

phase, to the successful induction of novice teachers into the profession are not known.

6. All interns assumed full responsibility for teaching two classes during the latter part of the internship and this particular responsibility was well monitored and documented. Other activities which were to accompany full time teaching during the second semester varied greatly among the internship. Little data were made available about these activities thus their function in facilitating induction into teaching remains unknown.

## Mentor Rating of MAT Program Features

Table 8 reports classroom mentor's perceptions of the MAT program. Features receiving the highest mean ratings were:

Program goals and objectives

Emphasis on Tennessee Career Ladder

Internship experiences

Potential for improving teaching

Support for the program in local systems

Effective use of Level II and III teachers

Potential for improving public education

Pedagogical mentors (Table 9) gave highest ratings to:

Screening and selection of interns

Field experience opportunities

Relating theory to practice

Integration of coursework and teaching

Provisions for appropriate field experiences

Partnerships between the university and school systems

Financial support

Potential for improving teaching

Attraction of teachers from work sectors in society

Use of Career Level II and III teachers

Potential for improving public education

## The Lyndhurst Program

The Lyndhurst Fellowships were developed as a one-year (one summer and two academic terms) program for certifying teachers for secondary schools. Eleven of the 18 persons entering the program in 1985-86 completed Cycle I. Following a summer semester of accelerated and clinically-based preparation they were employed in three different school systems on a part time basis and were under the direct supervision of teacher-mentors in the different school sites. Two types of university mentors also worked with the fellows: pedagogical mentors (n=3) and arts and science mentors (n=8).

### The Classroom Mentors

Classroom teachers (n=10) serving as Lyndhurst mentors were located in nine different schools in three different school systems. Most sites had one fellow assigned though two sites had two fellows and one fellow was in a school where MAT interns were also placed. Mentors typically worked with one fellow. In one setting, however, one mentor had two Lyndhurst fellows and in another setting a mentor worked with both a Lyndhurst fellow and a MAT intern. The Lyndhurst mentors had teaching experiences ranging from less than 5 years (n=2) to 7 having more than 11 years experience. Their teaching assignments were in mathematics (2), English (4), Science (3), with 1 involved in teaching combined areas. Some of these were teaching in senior high schools, 2 in junior high or middle schools, and 1 was in a K-8 school. In terms of experience with working with student teachers, 4 had no previous experience, 5 had worked with one to three student teachers, and 1 had worked with 7 or more. The mentor group was composed of 4 males and 6 females. The initial plan was to use Tennessee Career Level II or III teachers as mentors but this was not possible in some settings. Some of the mentors indicated that they had not become involved in the career ladder program because of disinterest or lack of teaching experience.

The Fellows were assigned courses in mathematics (1), English and reading

(2), sciences (4), social studies (2) and foreign language (2). Some of these were split assignments, e.g., foreign language and English and social studies with health.

Information about role. The Lyndhurst mentors, along with their principals, had limited information provided to them initially about the program, the interns, or mentoring. The following comments reflect mentor perceptions of the initial state-of-affairs:

> "I was told one day before I was supposed to do this (mentor) and that's all I was told... . I said, well, I'll do the best I can; what exactly is my task? Nobody could tell me... If I had had this list (mentoring activities checklist) in front of me at the beginning to give some kind of sense of what I was about, it would have been tremendously helpful to me."
>
> "It was sort of sprung on me. I got to school and they said, Guess what? You're going to do this. No one told me anything. I found out from the principal that we were to have a Lyndhurst teacher and that I was to be responsible for supervising."
>
> "I was at the central office one day and they said you will have one of the Lyndhurst students. I think that was on Thursday or Friday before school began. We came to school for our first inservice and she walked in."
>
> "She called and said 'Would you do this?' I said, 'What's involved?' She said, 'Just helping a new teacher' and I said 'Fine.'"
>
> "When I came to school there was a guy standing in the hallway looking at the chart. He said, 'You must be so and so.' I said, 'That's right.' He said 'You are my mentor.' I said, 'Great, what's that?' That was the first I heard about it."
>
> "The first information provided me was very quick and I really didn't know what was happening. I just got a notice that I was going to be a mentor when I came to school and that's all I knew. The information was very sketchy at the time."

Later printed information about the Lyndhurst program and mentoring was distributed and an orientation luncheon and workshop held, which was viewed very favorably. Also, pedagogical mentors from the college and the fellows were important sources of information regarding mentoring activities for the classroom teachers.

At the conclusion of Cycle I when the questionnaire was administered, the

item soliciting responses to "information about role and responsibility," 1 marked it as excellent, 6 as good, 2 as fair and 1 as poor. Thus the mentors, at the end of the year, as a group felt that they had sufficient information. This was not the case during the first weeks of the fall semester when the interns began their teaching.

Activities and relationships. The initial design of the Lyndhurst internships involved providing each teacher-mentor with an additional class period free of teaching responsibilities so that they would have time to work with their interns. This feature was planned in several sites where two fellows were to teach but in only one case was this operational throughout the school year. Thus the mentors had to make arrangements to interact when their interns as the school day permitted, before or after school, between class breaks or lunch, or during their daily planning periods if the fellows were not teaching at that time.

Mentor activities engaged in by all mentors included providing assistance and information relating to classroom instruction; sharing knowledge about the school or school system: monitoring, observing and advising; serving as a model of exemplary instruction, and sharing knowledge about the nuances of working within the school and system (see Table 3). Most of the mentors reported scheduling meetings with the fellows, introducing them to others, informing them of up-coming events, serving as an advocate, counselor, confidant, protector, and assisting the fellows in understanding the system's evaluation processes. A few reported that they helped the fellows solve personal problems and 2 said they assisted in the use of instructional technology (microcomputers).

In regard to support provided the mentors by school administrations, 9 rated it as excellent or good (see Table 1) and 9 rated support provided by the faculty as excellent or good. Nine also reported that they had good or excellent understandings of the mentor role.

Interviews with the Lyndhurst mentors revealed that the specific focus of their mentoring roles differed. Variations in role performances evolved as friendship patterns emerged, problems developed, fellows gained confidence and demonstrated competence, and as situational factors such as teaching schedules and subject area assignments permitted. One mentor noted that she "observed her fellow in class and then talked with her during the planning period. I found that it took a lot of time--hour and a half to two hours a day--to get the system working." She also noted how the relationship grew over the school year. "At first she would panic and say, 'What must I do'? As the situation became more comfortable she would say, 'Here's what happened'. Is this a good way to approach this or if I approach things this way, do you think that will solve the problem?' Later it became, 'Here's what I did, how do you react?'" Another noted that as the fellow became more confident in classroom management, she did not ask as many questions or seek as much advice, becoming more independent. The perception of the mentor role here was to be a resource, if needed. Another stated that the fellow was there to teach and he would be available if needed and his own teaching load and lack of time during the day to work with the intern prevented him from having an opportunity to do as good a job as he might have. He did observe the fellow several time during his planning period at the beginning of the school year.

In one relationship, the fellow was perceived as being afraid to come to the mentor with questions since the mentor was viewed as an evaluator. She convinced the fellow that she could freely come to her with a problem and eventually, as the year progressed, "gained the confidence that she could feel free to come to me." One mentor was concerned that the fellow continued to call him "Mr." at the end of the year. Also, he noted that the dramatic change in their relationship was that he viewed her as a student-teacher initially but, at the end of the year, saw her as a "fellow professional." This view of the fellow resulted from

her "assuming more responsibilities and showing me that she could handle them." This mentor also saw his main responsibility as helping the fellow become "acclimated to the school environment."

Several mentors noted the friendships that developed with the fellows. "We got to be better friends. We started out as two complete strangers, not knowing each other at all. We just got to know each other and, of course, at the end of the year she did not need nearly as much help." This same mentor reported that the role was mostly to be a "helpful friend" and being willing to "listen to a problem even if you can't contribute all that much. Sharing a problem with a teacher is helpful." When asked if she would like to do it again she responded: "Definitely, there wasn't that much hard work involved and this is something I would do anyway for a new teacher, even if I had not been asked." One mentor-fellow relationship evolved from both being new in the school setting. Both had gone back to school later in life and started new careers, and were close in age and the same sex. The mentor said, "We had an understanding immediately of each other, where we were, and where we were going. We had a lot of common interests and we could share that closeness." Her fellow, she reported, was much more relaxed as the school year drew to a close and that things that had initially bothered her no longer seemed to. The mentor role, as articulated by this person, was one of "taking my experience and helping her see through a situation and to say it's alright, I can understand why you feel this way because I felt that way myself." Thus be "willing to share, be open, and if there are times when you need to cry, you just cry."

Another mentor felt a lot was accomplished though the fellow was teaching a foreign language in which the mentor was not knowledgeable. Initially she thought, "My heavens, what am I supposed to do with this child when I don't speak the language?" She reported helping the fellow with class management and getting along in a school situation. Advice about instruction which she provided, were

"approaches to teaching," not teaching of the particular language. This mentor also mentioned how gratifying the mentor role had been because you could say to someone;

> "Here's some things you need to consider, here is some alternative that you might use, here is a path that you might go down and see where it takes you. It was so delightful to have someone eagerly listening and writing down and taking notes. I was not on an ego trip but then for her to come back and say "I did what you said and it worked," that was really good."

All the Lyndhurst mentors reported their roles as being very successful (7) or somewhat successful (2) though all thought the College of Education could better prepare them for their roles. Eight stated that school-related features (class schedules, teaching assignments, etc.) hindered them in their mentoring role. Some of the mentors indicated strong interest in serving again as mentors with the most negative reaction to the mentoring role being that it was "an infringement on my time. I feel the mentor should be paid for this. That is my biggest complaint and unless I am paid for it I probably won't do it again."

Constraining factors. Mentoring relationships in the Lyndhurst internships were constrained by several factors including specific features of the organizational context in which the interactions were to occur. These organizational aspects included teaching schedules which prohibited dialogue and cooperative planning, along with non-teaching responsibilities of the mentors.

A major factor which appeared to hinder the development of mentoring functions had to do with the professional roles assumed by the Lyndhurst Fellows. They met with the school faculties during the initial in-service days as new teachers and were to assume the responsibilities of teaching on the first day of school like the most seasoned veterans. Thus they were perceived as teachers by all those within the organization, including the students. While they were new in the organization and needed coaching from their mentors or others regarding

school practices and procedures, the professional role they assumed was often taken as an indication that no special mentoring support system to facilitate induction into teaching was needed.

By the end of the spring semester when interviews were conducted and the questionnaire administered, mentoring roles had changed drastically since they had been established at the beginning of the school year. Of those which continued to function, 3 reflected strong professional relationships with friendship bonding and 4 others remained functional though little interaction or communication between the mentors and interns was occurring at this time. Though four were dysfunctional, at least 2 of these had been positive early in the school year. Reasons for these diverse patterns, as they had evolved by the end of the school terms, are unknown though tenative explanations might be offered. Numerous factors appeared to strengthen or inhibit the forming or maintenance of strong mentor-fellow relations in the various sites. Mentor skills, professional competence, and persistence in the mentor role, facilitated by mutual interests with the fellow and a teaching schedule which allowed personal contact were clearly factors. Also, in some cases, fellows continued to need more assistance and guidance and thus continued relationships with the mentors were sustained. Factors which may have contributed to less contact between the mentor-fellow include strong, confident, and competent fellows who, as beginning teachers, needed little, if any, supervision or monitoring after the first few weeks of school. Their roles initially as beginning or new teachers, and not as student teachers, may have contributed substantially to the patterns which came to exist in that the majority of the relationships appeared to be task-oriented, clearly relating to a need for information on policy or practice, assistance in securing supplies or using equipment, or other specific request, usually initiated by the fellow. The apprentice nature of the fellows' teaching role may have been completed early in the school and they performed as professionally-competent

teachers, fully aware of the organizational context in which they worked. The independence reflected would be expected. Also, the mentors were to assist the interns in preparing for the systems' evaluation of their teaching. Once this was completed, continued need for a mentor diminished.

In some cases, fellows outgrew the mentors, who were perceived as having little to offer. This should not be viewed negatively or interpreted as failures in the mentoring roles. Rather, the growth reflected in the fellows necessitated that independence from the mentors was appropriate and that more fruitful interactions or networks be formed. Teaching schedules of the mentors and fellows were clearly a factor which hindered the maintenance of the relationships. When it was difficult to find time during the day for interactions, the mentoring role was difficult, though not impossible, to sustain.

Several mentors were inexperienced in working with student teachers or new teachers in their first assignments. This factor may have also contributed to some patterns which emerged. Also, failure to be sufficiently directive, assertative, and available during the early weeks of the relationship, a pattern detected, apparently negated the formation of a strong mentoring role. On the other hand, the effort to exert too much control and to have the fellow remain overly dependent, as was evidenced in one case, resulted in a dysfunctional relationship by the end of the second semester. Both of these extremes might be attributed to a lack of inexperience in mentoring as well as inadequate information relative to the role along with, of course, personality variables of the individuals involved.

Pedagogical Mentors

The function of education or pedagogical mentoring began with the start of the 1985-86 school year when the interns reported to the various school sites. Since the 3 college faculty working with the fellows were also involved in the

program as either instructor or coordinator, the mentoring relationship may have begun earlier on an informal basis. Conceptualization of this mentor role was "essentially a professional relationship that had open communication and dialogue for helping the intern grow and develop." Recognized also was that mentoring "would have to develop in a professional context depending on the two people involved and depending on their environment." Role ambiguity was to be expected and efforts to structure the relationships were to be avoided.

Education mentor role performances, as reflected in the interviews, appeared to be much like student teaching supervisory roles all had performed in the past. As stated by one mentor,

> "I was not told exactly what I should do but I perceived it to like supervising student teachers although I tried to trust them more as professionals. I gave them my office number and home telephone number and said anytime you have a problem or question, feel free to call me. I made myself accessible and I met them in the seminar from time to time. I made visits to their schools and I did just about everything they expected me to."

Another mentor reported: "at times I was monitoring, at times I was maybe going through the motions of being a mentor, not quite sure what I was doing."

As revealed in the interviews, Lyndhurst education mentoring was more active in the early weeks of the Cycle I internships in that more school visitations were made to observe and meet with their fellows and also to perform coordinating functions, including dealing with a lack of textbooks or instructional supplies and incompatible class schedules of the fellows and their mentors. By design, most monitoring of the fellows' teaching occurred early in the school year, with the education mentor role being one of essentially "backing off," especially after the system's evaluation of each fellow was established. Time spent in monitoring and supervising was also reported to be a function of the competencies and maturity of the individual

fellows. Some needed more psychological support and coaching in order to grow in confidence, assertiveness, skill in handling student discipline or achieving good classroom management techniques.

Though the education mentors reflected some uncertainty about the role they were to perform, they were positive. As reported by one,

> "the time I spent with them I think was adequate. Someone suggested that we needed to go more than three times a semester but I don't think that we need to. They don't need to be coddled and supervised as closely as student teachers because they are more mature and more capable."

Questionnaire solicited data regarding mentoring activities of the educator mentors (Table 3) reflect that all assisted their fellows with classroom instructional activities, monitored and advised the fellows, and served as an advocate when support was needed. Two reported being a confidant, counselor, or protector; meeting regularly with the fellows; and assisting in locating instructional resources. One mentor reported helping to solve personal problems, sharing information about the school and system, and assisting in understanding of the state's evaluation processes.

One reported problem associated with education mentoring in Cycle I had to do with serving as both program coordinator and mentor. Stating that the roles at times conflicted, this person recognized the uncertainty and conflict which resulted from having administration responsibilities for the program and obligations to the fellows as a professional mentor.

Generalizations which might be offered as descriptions of mentoring support provided by the education mentors in Cycle I of the program include emphasis early in the program in assisting with the early induction of the fellows into their teaching responsibilities and activities, providing coordination and problem solving functions, and structuring of the interrelationships in accordance with the teaching success of each fellow.

The Lyndhurst education mentors were fully aware of the variations of classroom-teacher mentoring support provided in the different school sites. Pedagogical mentors recognized that information about the program, the internship, and the functions of mentoring was not distributed early enough in Cycle I and that mentor roles may have taken on their essential character by the time information was available. Efforts to overcome this were made during the fall semester to communicate to both fellows and mentors role conceptualizations and suggested activities that might be appropriate within the constraints imposed by class teaching schedules, organization of the work day, and content of the courses being taught by each. In assessing the classroom mentoring observed in Cycle I, one education mentor reported that "we need to identify them earlier; early notification would be helpful; if their roles could be clarified to a greater extent, I think they would be more helpful to the Lyndhurst fellows."

Education mentors were aware of the mentoring systems that developed with the various school contexts and of the personality factors of both fellows and mentors which gave direction to the relationships. Incompatibility of class schedules was reported as a critical factor limiting mentor and fellow observations of each other in teaching roles, providing opportunity for becoming acquainted with each other, and for cooperative planning. In some school sites, even with class schedule conflicts present, mentoring support systems existed, at times through a networking or linking of the fellows with other faculty members who also served as mentors for the fellows. The linking role was encouraged and is believed to be an important dimension of the mentoring relationship. Cycle I fellows were reported to be resourceful in locating persons in the schools who could assist them and, when this occurred, some of the formalized mentoring established early in the school year, was no longer needed. The length of the internships--a full

academic year--allowed the fellows ample opportunities to identify faculty resources present and to form networks which served their needs. Their reduced teaching load provided opportunities also to interact freely with other teachers during the time of their daily planning periods. These factors, coupled with the strong personalities of some fellows and their role assignments as teachers, not students, collectively generated patterns of mentoring and networking normally not associated with education students participating in teacher induction programs.

Data obtained via interviews with the Lyndhurst education-mentors indicated extreme variations in understanding the roles and responsibilities the Arts & Science mentors assumed in Cycle I. One education-mentor possessed strong awareness of how these faculty members were functioning because of coordinating responsibility in the program. Another education-mentor, however, only knew that some faculty members from the academic disciplines were involved, responding that "I know nothing about what they did." As developed for Cycle I, the Lyndhurst pedagogical-mentors role did not include coordinating the support activities contributed by these subject specialists. Concern was registered that the Arts & Sciences mentors, once they became active in the 1986 spring semester, in some cases, assumed mentoring functions which should have remained the responsibilities of the education mentors. Also, in some cases, as school observations were begun by the Arts & Science mentors, education mentor school observations were reduced or stopped. Arts & Science mentor observation and evaluative reports on the fellows were not forwarded through the education-mentors for their information and use. Thus procedural responsibilities relative to the education-mentors coordinating, or even knowing about, what was occurring under the direction of the discipline representatives were not formalized in Cycle I of the program.

The perception of the contribution made by the Arts & Science people to the development was generally positive, especially by those aware of their involvement. Factors limiting their contributions to Cycle I were reported to related to a lack of role awareness and purposes of the program, along with late involvement. Numerous fellows reported to their education mentors the valuable assistance that had been provided by the Arts & Science people. One fellow, stated that the representative was serving as a mentor only because of the financial compensation provided. The guidance and counseling provided by the Arts & Science mentors was viewed favorably and only one fellow openly resisted the efforts of the mentor.

Arts and Science Mentors

Arranging for the involvement of the Arts and Science faculty mentors in the program presented a difficult challenge to the College of Education staff seeking to set it up. At least three months were needed to arrange for their participation and proceeding through the organizational structure of the university only created numerous delays and inconveniences. Eventually it was agreed that individual faculty could be contacted directly and they would be paid a financial compensation for their work with the interns. An informal system was essentially used in contacting and securing the participation of these faculty members. Some fellows initiated their own contacts, explained what would be involved, and secured the faculty member's commitment. By November of 1985, eight faculty had been invited to participate and their orientation to role provided through a group session. Disciplines represented by these faculty members included 2 each from English, foreign language, and history; 1 each from biology and mathematics.

Role orientation consisted of three minimum expectations. They were to be (a) content-area resource persons to assist the interns in their teaching; (b) arrange for the intern to enroll in a 2-3 hour credit course in the

discipline, (c) observe the intern's teaching and provide evaluative feedback. All three role expectations were designed to enhance the interns' competencies in the disciplines. Thus the role was conceptualized in an open and flexible manner. They were encouraged to proceed in an exploratory manner using their own judgments as to how they might best serve each intern. As reflected by the program director: "These people are professionals. Once they make commitments they are going to follow through on them. You don't have to worry about it. I let them do it their own way."

The mentoring role of the Arts and Science people was performed during the 1986 spring semester when they conducted their school site visitations, arranged for the fellows to secure course credit in their departments, and assisted the individual fellows with projects designed to enhance their understandings or skills in the separate disciplines. One of the mentors had been involved in Cycle I of the program to that point in time, having taught a course during the summer. Thus the mentors, with that one exception, had limited understanding of the program, no previous involvement in it, and possessed only limited awareness of just what their roles and relationships might be.

All mentors arranged for the fellows to enroll in one course in their departments, typically an independent study under the direction of the mentors. In one case a fellow enrolled in a regular course being taught by the mentor. The independent study courses were structured so that the activities would directly benefit the fellows in the content of the discipline or, in the case of those teaching science, the development of laboratory experiences which would complement classroom instruction. The English mentors gave emphasis to assisting in the teaching of literature and, especially, writing. Fellows working with the history mentors were assigned readings and related activities that would enhance their knowledge of unit

material taught during the spring semester, including American ethnic groups and minorities, immigration, discrimination, along with others. Foreign language mentors emphasized modern language methodology and literature of the language. The mathematics mentor encouraged fellow attainment of competence in geometry.

All mentors arranged visits to their fellows in the schools to observe their teaching. One mentor, who had four fellows, observed each one 10 times and another mentor made 8 visits to the site. Others visited less with one mentor reporting only one visitation. Following observations, the mentors made suggestions they thought appropriate and planned subsequent activities that they thought might be of value to the fellows. In the interviews, mentors reflected insightful understandings of the schools where the fellows were placed and constraints under which they worked. They became knowledgeable of the relationship fellows had with their classroom mentors. One mentor mentioned that the mentoring in the school was weak and he introduced the fellow to others who could provide help, thus serving a linking role. Several mentors observed material being taught that they had helped the fellows develop and others reported they were of value to the fellows in securing audio-visual materials or laboratory supplies. Evaluative reports on the observations were forwarded to the program coordinator.

Arts and Science mentors were pleased, for the most part, with the school sites where the interns were placed and most reported high visibility for the fellows. School faculties, students, and administrators were seen as being positive toward the fellows and the contributions they were making. Negative reactions offered related to the placement sites had to do with one situation, which was perceived to be unprofessional, where a vice-principal humiliated a fellow in front of students due to failure to follow a procedure

which had not been explained. Also, a shortage of paper in the school near the end of the school year was another problem reported. This prohibited the fellow from using ditto-machine prepared homework assignments. Ineffective mentoring was also noted in some of the sites. In at least one case the Arts and Science mentor thought the fellow had created problems which were unnecessary.

Mentoring, in addition to structured course work and school observations, reported by the Arts and Science faculty involved, consisted of varied patterns. One provided counseling relative to personal problems; another assisted in career counseling; several noted that they gave the fellows their home and office telephone numbers and told them to contact them at any time, which some did. All appeared willing to schedule help sessions with the interns as needed, in addition to sessions devoted to course credit activities.

Arts and Science faculty were most positive about their involvement and the kinds of experiences they had with the fellows, seeing them open to criticism, willing to accept and try their suggestions, and feeling that they had been of help in planning and implementing instruction. Several noted that their involvement had been of professional benefit to them; that the fifth year program was one they strongly supported, including the type of responsibility they had; serving again would be a pleasure.

Factors reported which may have limited their contribution included their late involvement in the program, failure to fully understand the program and its objectives, and their function in it. Role uncertainty, while clearly articulated in the interviews, was normally not viewed negatively since they valued the flexibility assigned to their responsibilities. The concerns noted were always addressed within the context of not having served as well as they could have in the mentoring

role, thereby providing less assistance than they might have, had they had a better understanding of what they were to do and more time.

Some of uncertainty of the role is easily reflected in the following comments:

> Only in the last few weeks did I have a good grasp of what we were trying to do.
>
> I was not as structured or as constructive as I could have been, if I had known from the start what we were trying to do.
>
> I thought my function would be more or less that of professor of education when someone is doing student teaching. Go visit a couple of times and make an evaluation. I think they want us to be much more involved. This realization came about eventually.
>
> It has only been recently that this thing has fallen into place.
>
> By the time I realized what was happening, it was almost too late beacuse the semester was ending and time became a factor.
>
> My only regret was that we didn't have much contact. But we did talk on the phone.
>
> I wish I could have had earlier access and I would have made more suggestions. She was well into the school year before I met her.
>
> I was confused about the two different programs because I was only familiar with what I did.
>
> Completing the questionnaire gave me a broad picture of what was being done. It helped me appreciate what the young woman had accomplished.
>
> We actually ended up working more in methodology because her content was not a problem.
>
> I was confused about the difference between Arts and Science and pedagogical mentors. I wasn't sure which was mine.

Though role uncertainty was present, role performance as assessed here was positive, of considerable benefit to the interns, and consistent with the goal of the program--that of enhancing the teaching competencies of the fellows. It should be noted, however, that the primary focus appeared to be pedagogical since instructional methods were perceived to be in greatest need of development. Where content-related understandings of skills were evident,

these were, however, given attention.

Internship Activities of the Fellows

The Lyndhurst fellowships consisted of two basic components: formal course work and employment as a part-time teacher in a cooperating school system. Along with teaching of three classes, the fellows were expected to have various experiences in the school sites under direction of the teacher-mentors and/or pedagogical mentors. These experiences, along with teaching, included, for some, homeroom responsibility, becoming affiliated with a school club or other extracurricular activity, classroom observation of the mentor and other teachers, attending faculty meetings, participating in school-sponsored activities and in general, gaining an understanding of the life of the school. All fellows were responsible for three classes, involving two different preparations. In some instances fellows had honors sections or advanced placement classes. No major problems were known to result, relative to the assignments, in regard to student, faculty, or staff reactions. The problems noted that related directly to placements occurred in some sites when Lyndhurst fellows dropped out of the program and school class schedules had to be adjusted.

Some fellows had homeroom responsibilities (Table 7). This was to be a second semester assignment in which they assisted their mentors but not all assumed this role. All interns were reported to have attended school faculty meetings and some had opportunities to participate in departmental meetings or attended system-wide staff development programs. Five of the fellows became affiliated with extracurricular programs. All conducted parent conferences. All but one fellow participated in the system or state's evaluation. In this one case the central office person responsible did not conduct the evaluation.

Classroom mentor perceptions of the Lyndhurst internships were generally

positive. The highest means yielded by the internship subscale in the questionnaire (see Table 2) were its value to the profession of teaching and to the school system. Acceptance of the internship by the administration and by the faculty were reported as good as was its benefit to the total school program. The lowest mean rating was associated with the adequacy of initial planning for the internship.

The employment of the Lyndhurst teaching fellows in the schools was an avenue through which some principals were able to enrich their program of studies through the staffing flexibility provided. Two cases demonstrate this development. In one school, conversational French was added to the curriculum since the Lyndhurst follow had competence in the language and was interested in teaching such classes. In another school, the presence of the fellow permitted reassignment of the teacher-mentor to general classes in computer literacy, thus permitting the development of a school-wide computer program. In other locations the presence of the interns enhanced teachings competencies that probably would not have been there without the program. This was especially true in the science field. One fellow was used to relieve a teaching principal so that school coordination could be increased.

As shown in Table 7, the pedagogical mentors confirmed that the fellows had participated in the activities reported by the classroom mentors, with a few exceptions. Discrepancies in the frequencies reported are partly explained by the way in which data were obtained from the education mentors. They completed only one questionnaire each and thus had to indicate generalizable patterns of activities engaged in by their interns. Classroom-mentors completed questionnaires on each fellow. Nevertheless, educator mentor data are inaccurate in several instances. Other data indicate that all fellows did not participate in all activities reported. All did perform as classroom teachers, for which they were compensated, and

all did attend school-wide faculty meetings, meet with parents, and use instructional resources available in the schools. Some fellows had homeroom responsibilities from the beginning of the school year, which one education mentor reported became an issue since all did not have this responsibility. All, however, were to assist in homeroom responsibilities at some time in order to understand this feature of school life. At the time when the interviews were being conducted with the teachers, all had not engaged in this activity. Variations existing in the Lyndhurst internships were known. Also known were factors producing the variations, including school-related developments and circumstances of individual fellows, coupled with coordinating functions provided by educator-mentors and classroom-mentors.

Special school-related problems associated with the Lyndhurst internship, according to education-mentors, included those resulting from fellows withdrawing from the program, school administrators lack of attentiveness and action regarding textbooks being available and coordination of the required evaluations of the fellows, along with a lack of compatibility of fellows and mentors teaching assignments. Internship problems directly associated with some fellows included lack of observations and involvement in teaching prior to the beginning of the internships, inadequate skill in instructional methodology and classroom management, and lack of personal confidence in the role of teachers. Competence in the subject matter taught was not noted as a problem or weakness by the education mentors in the Cycle I fellows. Fellows reportedly weak in some areas of instruction demonstrated remarkable growth. No personality-related mentoring role problems necessitated changing mentor-fellow assignments established though some conflicts may have limited mentoring functions provided.

In several instances Lyndhurst fellows became highly visible in the schools. Exposure for three fellows resulted from their knowledge of the

Tennessee Instructional Model. They assisted teachers in their schools in the use of the model, through help sessions. Fellows' knowledge of the Tennessee Career Ladder Program and its evaluation processes were also evident. Some requested materials from the university needed by different teachers, including lesson plan formats. Fellows, in most cases, had visibility. For one fellow visibility was system-wide. This individual was highlighted by the system and requested to participate in a system-wide instructional development project.

Sponsorship of the fellows by their mentors was clearly evident in several cases, according to the college mentors. These fellows were recommended by their mentors as competent teachers that they would like to have assigned to the schools on a full-time basis. This was perceived as strong endorsement of the internship program and reflects professional acknowledgement of the quality of teaching the fellows had provided.

Mentor Ratings of Lyndhurst Program Components

As shown in Tables 8 and 9, mentors participating in Cycle I of the program reflect different patterns in rating selected program aspects on a scale of 1 to 5. Program features receiving the highest mean ratings (means of at least 4.50) are listed by mentors groups below.

Pedagogical

Screening and selection of fellows

Monitoring/feedback provided the interns

Arts and Science

Program goals and objectives

Screening and selection of fellows

Support for the program in local school systems

Potential for improving public education

Classroom

None

## Findings

### Lyndhurst Mentoring and Internship

Mentoring

1. Effective mentoring support systems were found functioning in all three types of formalized relationships, though role uncertainties remained throughout the internship in all mentoring categories.

2. All classroom mentor-fellow pairings yielded early support which facilitated initial socialization in the schools and induction into teaching roles.

3. Selected classroom teacher-fellow relationships reflected strong emotional bondings that enhanced career-related functions of coaching, exposure, and most especially, sponsorship.

4. The more supportive teacher-fellow pairings involved same sex mentoring with age variances ranging from almost none to several years; none were bi-racial. Those factors were not, however, incorporated as study variables in the inquiry and thus are tenatively formulated as possible influential variables.

5. Pedagogical mentoring served primarily to assist the fellows during early internship experiences and was heavily oriented toward coordinating relationships, directing and monitoring the intern and solving problems emerging in the different placements.

6. Pedagogical-mentor relationships with classroom-mentors varied extensively with little active involvement in coaching others in mentoring role development reported.

7. Faculty representatives from the Arts and Sciences contributed important mentoring support, especially as professional role models, coaching

of the interns toward increased mastery of the disciplines, and assisting with classroom instructional activities. Contributions made to classroom activities were mainly pedagogical, though not exclusively.

8. Arts and Sciences' faculty involvement in novice teacher induction and socialization reflects an innovative programmatic feature. Those serving in Cycle I viewed positively their involvement though it was less than they desired.

9. Lack of experience in assisting novice teachers, along with holding low status position within school faculties, appeared to be factors which constrained the development of strong mentoring relationships among some of the mentor-fellow pairings.

10. School staffing patterns which prohibited freeing teacher-mentors of regular teachding responsibilities to work with the Lyndhurst fellows limited interactions between teachers and fellows needed to facilitate mentoring relations. When such arrangements had to cease, readjustments in mentors' teaching loads became obstacles to effective mentoring throughout the duration of the program.

Internships

1. The Lyndhurst program demonstrated that individuals competent in selected disciplines, and with minimal preparation in classroom pedagogy, can, with properly structured support and reduced teaching role responsibilities, be successfully socialized and inducted into teaching roles.

2. School faculties and administrators, as well as students and parents, recognized the fellows as legitimate in their teaching roles and few negative perceptions of their comeptencies, commitments, or skills were disclosed.

3. Variations noted among the interns in role responsibilities and

teaching experiences resulted from several factors: school principal assigned tasks, mentor direction, and fellow initiated activities.

4. School context factors (class schedules, course assignments, etc.) in the various sites yielded diverse program effects, especially in regard to mentor-fellow relationships.

5. Fellows, in most cases, achieved good exposure and high visibility in the schools and school systems. Fellows also available themselves of opportunities to share their knowledge and skills with other faculty.

6. Lyndhurst fellows demonstrated resourcefulness in forming productive relationships with others in the schools, reflecting awareness and skill in utilizing power and influence factors existing in the social orders of the schools in order to serve their own career-related goals.

7. Sponsorship of several fellows by their mentors and others in the school was openly stated and at a high level during the final weeks of the Lyndhdurst internships.

8. Presence of the fellows in certain school sites permitted administrators to staff differently, thus enhancing student curricular options. Increased fellow visibility within the school-community resulted when these courses were available.

9. Fellow inadequacies in teaching competencies noted during the early stages of the internships included lack of personal confidence and assertiveness; limited planning and pupil management skills; ineffective communication skills; inadequate knowledge of routines and procedures. All these weaknesses noticeably improved as the internships progressed. Thus these particular intern competencies were those most noticeably affected by the apprentice nature of the internships.

10. Competencies in the subjects taught by the interns were viewed as special strengths. Exceptions were some inadequacies reported by

representatives from the Arts and Science departments of the university.

Table 1

Mentoring Role: Information and Support

MAT n = 12; Lyndhurst n = 10

| | | Exc 4 | Good 3 | Fair 2 | Poor 1 | NA/UK Ø | $\bar{X}$ | S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Information provided about your role and responsibility | M | 2(17) | 7(58) | 2(17) | 1(8) | | 2.83 | .84 |
| | L | 1(10) | 6(60) | 2(20) | 1(10) | | 2.70 | .82 |
| Support provided by the school administration | M | 8(67) | 4(33) | | | | 3.83 | .82 |
| | L | 4(40) | 5(50) | | 1(10) | | 3.20 | .92 |
| Support provided by the school faculty | M | 2(17) | 9(25) | | | 1(8) | 2.92 | 1.00 |
| | L | 3(30) | 6(60) | | 1(10) | | 3.10 | .88 |
| Understanding of the objectives of mentoring | M | 4(33) | 7(58) | | 1(8) | | 3.25 | 1.10 |
| | L | 2(20) | 7(70) | | | 1(10) | 2.90 | 1.10 |

Table 2

Perceptions of the Internship

MAT n = 12; Lyndhurst n = 10

| | | Exc 4 | Good 3 | Fair 2 | Poor 1 | NA/UK Ø | $\bar{X}$ | S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adequacy of initial planning for the intern | M | 2(17) | 2(17) | 4(33) | 3(33) | 1(8) | 2.73 | 1.10 |
| | L | 2(20) | 5(50) | 1(10) | 2(20) | | 2.70 | 1.06 |
| Benefit to the total school program | M | 4(33) | 5(42) | 2(17) | | 1(8) | 3.18 | .75 |
| | L | 5(50) | 3(30) | 1(10) | 1(10) | | 3.20 | 1.03 |
| Acceptance by the faculty | M | 5(42) | 4(33) | 2(17) | | 1(8) | 3.27 | .79 |
| | L | 4(40) | 4(40) | | | 1(10) | 3.20 | 1.22 |
| Acceptance by the administration | M | 7(58) | 3(25) | 1(8) | | 1(8) | 3.55 | .69 |
| | L | 5(50) | 4(40) | 1(10) | | | 3.40 | .70 |
| Value to the school system | M | 6(50) | 3(25) | 2(17) | | 1(8) | 3.36 | .81 |
| | L | 6(60) | 3(30) | | 1(10) | | 3.50 | .71 |
| Value to the teaching profession | M | 9(75) | 1(8) | 1(8) | | 1(8) | 3.73 | .65 |
| | L | 7(70) | 2(20) | 1(10) | | | 3.60 | .70 |

Table 3

Number and Frequencies of Mentoring Activities

by Classroom Mentor Groups

| | Groups | |
|---|---|---|
| | MAT n=13 | Lyndhurst n=10 |
| 1. Assisted in planning for instruction, classroom activities, student assignments | 13/100 | 9/90 |
| 2. Shared knowledge regarding instructional strategies, accommodations and techniques | 13/100 | 10/100 |
| 3. Shared knowledge of school and system policies, practices, expectations | 13/100 | 10/100 |
| 4. Scheduled regular meetings to discuss topics of mutual interest | 10/77 | 7/70 |
| 5. Regularly monitored the intern's activities | 13/100 | 9/90 |
| 6. Introduced the intern to faculty/staff, parents and community people, school system personnel | 12/92 | 10/100 |
| 7. Observed and evaluated the intern's teaching and related school activities | 13/100 | 10/100 |
| 8. Advised the intern about potential problems | 13/100 | 10/100 |
| 9. Shared information about upcoming events such as parent conferences, school activities, student responses to grades, deadlines for reports, etc. | 12/92 | 10/100 |
| 10. Served as a confidant and counselor | 12/92 | 10/100 |
| 11. Helped in solving personal problems | 8/62 | 5/50 |
| 12. Served as an advocate when support was needed | 12/92 | 8/80 |
| 13. Served as a protector when the intern was open to criticism or attack | 11/85 | 7/70 |
| 14. Shared knowledge about the nuances of working successfully within the school and system | 13/100 | 8/80 |
| 15. Provided a model of exemplary instruction | 13/100 | 9/90 |
| 16. Assisted in locating and using instructional resources | 13/100 | 10/100 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 17. Shared knowledge about classroom management procedures | 13/100 | 10/100 |
| 18. Assisted in understanding the state/system's evaluation processes | 12/92 | 2/20 |
| 19. Assisted in the use of instructional technology (microcomputers) | 2/15 | 5/50 |

Table 4

Number and Percentages of Personal Characteristics by Mentor Groups

| | Mentor Groups | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Classroom | | University | | |
| | MAT n=13 | Lyn n=10 | MAT | Lynd | A & S |
| 1. Human relations skills | 13/100 | 10/100 | 3/100 | 3/100 | 5/63 |
| 2. Professional preparation | 13/100 | 10/100 | 3/100 | 2/67 | 7/88 |
| 3. Personal philosophy and attitudes | 13/100 | 10/100 | 3/100 | 3/100 | 6/75 |
| 4. Personal interest in the careers of beginning teachers | 12/93 | 10/100 | 3/100 | 3/100 | 7/88 |
| 5. Competence in problem solving | 12/93 | 10/100 | 3/100 | 3/100 | 5/63 |
| 6. Understanding student interests and needs | 12/93 | 10/100 | 3/100 | 2/67 | 5/63 |
| 7. Understanding the complexities of teaching and learning | 13/100 | 9/90 | 3/100 | 2/67 | 6/75 |
| 8. Skill in relating theory to practice | 11/85 | 7/70 | 3/100 | 2/67 | 6/75 |
| 9. Knowledge and skill in use of instructional technology (microcomputers) | 3/24 | 2/20 | 0/0 | 1/33 | 1/13 |
| 10. Competence in planning and organizing | 13/100 | 7/70 | 2/67 | 2/67 | 4/50 |
| 11. Communication competencies | 13/100 | 9/90 | 3/100 | 3/100 | 5.63 |
| 12. Breadth of subject matter understanding | 12/93 | 6/60 | 1/33 | 1/33 | 7/88 |
| 13. Personal involvement in professional activities | 12/93 | 8/80 | 2/67 | 2/67 | 7/88 |
| 14. Compatable personal background | 12/93 | 9/90 | 2/67 | 2/67 | 4/50 |
| 15. Understanding schools as formal organizations | 12/93 | 8/80 | 2/67 | 2/67 | 5/63 |
| 16. Confidence as a role model | 13/100 | 10/100 | 3/100 | 1/33 | 4/50 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17. Commitment to the education profession | 13/100 | 9/90 | 3/100 | 3/100 | 6/75 |
| 18. Experience as a classroom teacher | 13/100 | 10/100 | 3/100 | 2/67 | 7/88 |
| 19. Accessibility | 13/100 | 9/90 | 3/100 | 2/67 | 7/88 |

Table 5

Number and Frequencies of Mentoring Activities by University Mentor Groups

| | Groups | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | MAT n=3 | Lyndhurst n=3 | Arts & Sc n=8 |
| 1. Assisted in planning for instruction, classroom activities, student assignments | 3/100 | 3/100 | 3/38 |
| 2. Shared knowledge regarding instructional strategies, accommodations and techniques | 3/100 | 3/100 | 6/75 |
| 3. Shared knowledge of school and system policies, practices, expectations | 2/67 | 1/33 | 2/25 |
| 4. Scheduled regular meetings to discuss topics of mutual interest | 3/100 | 2/67 | 5/63 |
| 5. Regularly monitored the intern's activities | 3/100 | 3/100 | 6/75 |
| 6. Introduced the intern to faculty/staff, parents and community people, school system personnel | 2/67 | 0/0 | 1/13 |
| 7. Observed and evaluated the intern's teaching and related school activities | 3/100 | 3/100 | 7/88 |
| 8. Advised the intern about potential problems | 3/100 | 3/100 | 6/75 |
| 9. Shared information about upcoming events such as parent conferences, school activities, student responses to grades, deadlines for reports, etc. | 1/33 | 0/0 | 0/0 |
| 10. Served as a confidant and counselor | 3/100 | 2/67 | 5/63 |
| 11. Helped in solving personal problems | 2/67 | 1/33 | 1/13 |
| 12. Served as an advocate when support was needed | 3/100 | 3/100 | 2/25 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13. Served as a protector when the intern was open to criticism or attack | 3/100 | 2/67 | 0/0 |
| 14. Shared knowledge about the nuances of working successfully within the school and system | 3/100 | 2/67 | 1/13 |
| 15. Provided a model of exemplary instruction | 2/67 | 0/0 | 5/63 |
| 16. Assisted in locating and using instructional resources | 1/33 | 2/67 | 5/63 |
| 17. Shared knowledge about classroom management procedures | 3/100 | 3/100 | 5/63 |
| 18. Assisted in understanding the state/system's evaluation processes | 3/100 | 1/33 | 0/0 |
| 19. Assisted in the use of instructional technology (microcomputers) | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 |

Table 6

Personal Characteristics by University Mentor Groups

| | Groups | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | MAT n=3 | Lyndhurst n=3 | Arts & Sc n=8 |
| 1. Human relations skills | 3/100 | 3/100 | 5/63 |
| 2. Professional preparation | 3/100 | 2/67 | 7/88 |
| 3. Personal philosophy and attitudes | 3/100 | 3/100 | 6/75 |
| 4. Personal interest in the careers of beginning teachers | 3/100 | 3/100 | 7/88 |
| 5. Competence in problem solving | 3/100 | 3/100 | 5/63 |
| 6. Understanding student interests and needs | 3/100 | 2/67 | 5/63 |
| 7. Understanding the complexities of teaching and learning | 3/100 | 2/67 | 6/75 |
| 8. Skill in relating theory to practice | 3/100 | 2/67 | 6/75 |
| 9. Knowledge and skill in use of instructional technology (microcomputers) | 0/0 | 1/33 | 1/13 |
| 10. Competence in planning and organizing | 2/67 | 2/67 | 4/50 |
| 11. Communication competencies | 3/100 | 3/100 | 4/50 |
| 12. Breadth of subject matter understanding | 1/33 | 1/33 | 7/88 |
| 13. Personal involvement in professional activities | 2/67 | 1/33 | 6/75 |
| 14. Compatable personal background | 2/67 | 2/67 | 4/50 |
| 15. Understanding schools as formal organizations | 3/100 | 2/67 | 5/63 |
| 16. Confidence as a role model | 3/100 | 1/33 | 4/50 |
| 17. Commitment to the education profession | 3/100 | 3/100 | 6/75 |
| 18. Experience as a classroom teacher | 3/100 | 2/67 | 7/88 |
| 19. Accessibility | 3/100 | 2/67 | 7/88 |

Table 7

Number and Frequencies of Intern Activities by Mentor Groups

| | Mentor Groups | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Classroom | | University | | |
| | Mat n=13 | Lyn n=10 | MAT n=3 | Lyn n=3 | A & Sc n=8 |
| 1. Assumed responsibility for classroom teaching | 13/100 | 10/100 | 3/100 | 3/100 | 7/88 |
| 2. Participated in department and/or school faculty meetings | 9/69 | 10/100 | 3/100 | 3/100 | 2/25 |
| 3. Attended professional meetings | 10/77 | 5/50 | 3/100 | 2/67 | 0/0 |
| 4. Attended in-service or staff development activities | 8/62 | 9/90 | 3/100 | 3/100 | 3/38 |
| 5. Assumed responsibility for a homeroom | 9/69 | 7/70 | 2/67 | 3/100 | 5/63 |
| 6. Served in an affiliate role in one or more co-curricular activities | 5/38 | 5/50 | 2/67 | 1/33 | 2/25 |
| 7. Participated in parent conferences | 8/62 | 10/100 | 2/67 | 2/67 | 6/75 |
| 8. Observed you (the mentor) in an instructional role | 13/100 | 8/80 | 3/100 | 1/33 | 5/63 |
| 9. Observed other teachers in instructional roles | 13/100 | 4/40 | 2/67 | 3/100 | 6/75 |
| 10. Utilized resources, equipment, and facilities of the school | 12/92 | 9/90 | 3/100 | 3/100 | 6/75 |
| 11. Attended school-sponsored activities in the afternoon, | 8/62 | 6/60 | 3/100 | 3/100 | 2/25 |

Table 8

Classroom Mentors Perceptions of the Five Year Program

MAT n = 12; Lyndhurst n = 10

| | | About the Superior 5 | Same 4 | Infer. 3 | 2(1) | NA/UK 0 | $\bar{X}$ | S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall program goals and objectives | M | 8(67) | 1(8) | 1(8) | | 2(17) | 4.70 | .68 |
| | L | 3(30) | 3(30) | 3(30) | | 1(10) | 4.00 | .87 |
| Coordination and management of the program | M | 4(33) | 2(17) | 4(33) | 1(8) | 1(8) | 3.82 | 1.08 |
| | L | 6(60) | 4(40) | | | | 3.60 | .52 |
| Recruitment procedures for identifying students/interns | M | 1(8) | 1(8) | 4(33) | | 6(50) | 3.50 | .84 |
| | L | | 4(40) | 1(10) | | 5(50) | 3.80 | .45 |
| Screening and selection of students/interns | M | 1(8) | 2(17) | 2(17) | 1(8) | 6(50) | 3.50 | 1.05 |
| | L | 2(20) | 1(10) | 2(20) | | 5(50) | 4.00 | 1.00 |
| Preparation in general education | M | 2(17) | 6(50) | 2(17) | | 2(17) | 4.00 | .67 |
| | L | 2(20) | 2(20) | 5(50) | | 1(10) | 3.67 | .87 |
| Preparation in subject area specializations | M | 6(50) | 4(33) | 1(8) | | 1(8) | 4.46 | .69 |
| | L | 5(40) | 2(20) | 3(30) | | 1(10) | 4.11 | .93 |
| Preparation in classroom pedagogy | M | | 6(50) | 4(33) | | 2(17) | 3.60 | .52 |
| | L | 2(20) | 3(30) | 4(30) | | 1(10) | 3.78 | .83 |
| Preparation in understanding schools as organizations | M | 2(17) | 1(8) | 4(33) | | 5(42) | 3.71 | .95 |
| | L | 1(10) | 7(70) | 1(10) | | 1(10) | 3.11 | .78 |
| Focus on the ethics of teaching | M | 1(8) | 6(50) | 2(17) | | 3(25) | 3.89 | .60 |
| | L | 1(10) | 1(10) | 7(70) | | 1(10) | 3.33 | .71 |
| Preparation in understanding learning and human development | M | 1(8) | 4(33) | 2(17) | | 5(42) | 3.86 | .69 |
| | L | 1(10) | 1(10) | 7(70) | | 1(10) | 3.33 | .71 |
| Opportunities for field experiences and observations prior to actual teaching | M | 5(42) | 3(25) | 2(17) | | 2(17) | 4.30 | .82 |
| | L | | 3(30) | 2(20) | | 4(40) | 3.17 | 1.17 |
| Focus on relating theory to practice | M | 3(25) | 3(25) | 2(17) | | 4(33) | 4.13 | .84 |
| | L | 2(20) | 3(30) | 3(30) | 1(10) | 1(10) | 3.67 | 1.00 |
| Emphasis given to role and functions of mentors | M | 3(25) | 7(58) | 1(8) | | 1(8) | 4.18 | .60 |
| | L | 4(40) | 1(10) | 4(40) | 1(10) | | 3.80 | 1.14 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Integration of course work, practicums, and classroom teaching | M | 5(41) | 4(33) | 1(8) | | 2(17) | 4.40 | .70 |
| | L | 1(10) | 5(50) | 2(20) | | 2(20) | 3.87 | .64 |
| Emphasis on the use of instructional technology, especially the microcomputer | M | 1(8) | 2(17) | 4(33) | | 5(42) | 3.57 | .79 |
| | L | | 1(10) | 3(30) | 1(10) | 5(50) | 3.00 | .71 |
| Emphasis on the Tennessee Career Ladder Competencies | M | 5(42) | 4(33) | | | 3(25) | 4.56 | .53 |
| | L | 5(50) | 3(30) | 3(30) | | 1(10) | 4.00 | .87 |
| Coordinated roles of public school and university mentors | M | 4(33) | 3(25) | 4(33) | | 1(8) | 4.00 | .89 |
| | L | 3(30) | 4(40) | 1(10) | 2(20) | | 3.80 | 1.14 |
| Provisions for appropriate experiences of students/ interns in school settings | M | 6(50) | 5(42) | | | | 4.55 | .52 |
| | L | 4(40) | 4(40) | 1(10) | 1(10) | 1(8) | 4.10 | .99 |
| Providing monitoring/feedback for the student intern | M | 6(50) | 2(17) | 2(17) | | 2(17) | 4.40 | .84 |
| | L | 2(20) | 5(50) | 2(20) | 1(10) | | 3.80 | .92 |
| Use of evaluative information for program revision and improvement | M | 4(33) | 2(17) | 1(8) | | 5(42) | 4.43 | .79 |
| | L | 2(20) | 4(40) | 2(20) | | 2(20) | 4.00 | .76 |
| Partnership arrangement between the public school and the university | M | 5(42) | 4(33) | 2(17) | | | 4.27 | .79 |
| | L | 4(40) | 4(40) | 2(20) | | 1(8) | 4.20 | .79 |
| Financial support for the program | M | 2(17) | 2(17) | 2(17) | | 6(50) | 4.00 | .89 |
| | L | 4(40) | | | 1(10) | 5(50) | 4.20 | 1.79 |
| Potential for improving the profession of teaching | M | 8(67) | 3(25) | | | 1(8) | 4.73 | .47 |
| | L | 4(40) | 4(40) | 2(20) | | | 4.20 | .79 |
| Support for the program in the state | M | 5(17) | 4(33) | | | 6(50) | 4.33 | .52 |
| | L | | 1(10) | 2(20) | | 7(70) | 3.33 | .58 |
| Support for the program in the local school systems | M | 5(42) | 3(25) | | | 4(33) | 4.63 | .52 |
| | L | 2(20) | 4(40) | 2(20) | | 2(10) | 4.00 | .76 |
| Focus on attracting teachers from business, military, and other sectors of society | M | 4(33) | 3(25) | 3(25) | | 2(17) | 4.10 | .88 |
| | L | 2(20) | 4(40) | 2(20) | 1(10) | 1(10) | 3.77 | .97 |
| Focus on effective use of Career Level II and III teachers | M | 8(67) | 2(17) | | | 2(17) | 4.80 | .42 |
| | L | 1(10) | 5(50) | 1(10) | 1(10) | 2(20) | 3.75 | .89 |
| Overall potential for improving public education | M | 8(67) | 2(17) | | | 2(17) | 4.80 | .42 |
| | L | 5(50) | 3(30) | 2(20) | | | 4.30 | .82 |

Table 9

University Mentors Perceptions of the Five Year Programs

MAT n = 12; Lyndhurst n = 10; Arts & Sciences n = 8

| | | About the Superior 5 | Same 4 | Infer. 3 | 2(1) | NA/UK Ø | $\bar{X}$ | S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall program goals and objectives | M | 1(33) | 2(67) | 1(8) | | 2(17) | 4.33 | .58 |
| | L | | 3(100) | | | | 4.00 | Ø |
| | A & S | 5(63) | 2(25) | | | | 4.71 | .49 |
| Coordination and management of the program | M | 1(33) | 1(33) | 1(33) | | | 4.00 | 1.00 |
| | L | 6(60) | 3(100) | | | | 4.00 | .Ø |
| | A & S | 1(12) | 5(63) | | | | 4.17 | .41 |
| Recruitment procedures for identifying students/interns | M | 2(67) | | | 1(33) | | 3.67 | 2.31 |
| | L | 1(33) | 2(67) | | | | 4.33 | .58 |
| | A & S | 1(12) | 4(50) | | | | 4.2 | .45 |
| Screening and selection of students/interns | M | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | | 4.67 | .58 |
| | L | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | | 4.67 | .58 |
| | A & S | 2(25) | 2(25) | | | | 4.50 | .58 |
| Preparation in general education | M | 1(33) | | 2(67) | | | 3.67 | 1.16 |
| | L | 1(33) | | 2(67) | | | 3.67 | 1.16 |
| | A & S | 2(25) | 2(25) | 1(12) | | | 4.20 | .84 |
| Preparation in subject area specializations | M | | 3(100) | | | | 4.00 | Ø |
| | L | | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | 3.68 | .58 |
| | A & S | 2(25) | 3(38) | 1(12) | | | 4.17 | .76 |
| Preparation in classroom pedagogy | M | 1(33) | | 2(67) | | | 3.667 | 1.16 |
| | L | | 3(100) | | | | 4.00 | Ø |
| | A & S | 3(38) | 2(25) | 1(12) | | | 4.167 | 1.16 |
| Preparation in understanding schools as organizations | M | | | 2(67) | 1(33) | | 3.33 | .58 |
| | L | | 1(33) | 2(67) | | | 3.33 | .58 |
| | A & S | 1(12) | 2(25) | | | 1(12) | 3.75 | 1.26 |
| Focus on the ethics of teaching | M | | 1(33) | 2(67) | | | 3.33 | .58 |
| | L | | 3(100) | | | | 3.00 | Ø |
| | A & S | 3(38) | | | | 1(12) | 4.25 | 1.50 |
| Preparation in understanding learning and human development | M | | 1(33) | 2(67) | | | 3.33 | .58 |
| | L | | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | 3.67 | .58 |
| | A & S | 2(25) | 1(12) | | 1(12) | | 4.00 | 1.41 |
| Opportunities for field experiences and observations prior to actual teaching | M | 2(67) | | | | | 5.00 | Ø |
| | L | | | | 3(100) | | 1.67 | .58 |
| | A & S | 2(25) | 2(25) | 1(12) | | | 4.20 | .84 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Focus on relating theory to practice | M | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | | | 4.67 | .58 |
| | L | | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | | 3.77 | .58 |
| | A & S | 2(25) | 2(25) | 1(12) | | | 3(38) | 2/50 | 2.19 |
| Emphasis given to role and functions of mentors | M | 1(33) | 2(67) | | | | | 4.33 | .58 |
| | L | | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | | 3.67 | .58 |
| | A & S | 3(38) | 3(38) | 1(12) | | | | 4.29 | .76 |
| Integration of course work, practicums, and classroom teaching | M | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | | | 4.67 | .58 |
| | L | | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | | 3.67 | .58 |
| | A & S | 2(25) | 4(50) | | | | | 4.33 | .52 |
| Emphasis on the use of instructional technology, especially the microcomp. | M | | | 3(100) | | | | 3.00 | 0 |
| | L | | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | | 3.67 | .58 |
| | A & S | | 2(25) | 2(25) | | | | 3.50 | .58 |
| Emphasis on the Tennessee Career Ladder Competencies | M | | 3(100) | | | | | 4.00 | 0 |
| | L | 1(33) | 2(67) | | | | | 4.33 | .57 |
| | A & S | 1(12) | 2(25) | | 1(12) | | | 3.75 | 1.26 |
| Coordinated roles of public school and university mentors | M | 1(33) | 2(67) | | | | | 4.33 | .58 |
| | L | 1(33) | 2(67) | | | | | 4.33 | .58 |
| | A & S | 2(25) | 3(38) | 1(12) | | | | 4.17 | .75 |
| Provisions for appropriate experiences of students/ interns in school settings | M | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | | | 4.67 | .57 |
| | L | | 2(67) | | 1(33) | | | 3.33 | 1.55 |
| | A & S | 2(25) | 4(50) | | | | | 4.33 | .52 |
| Providing monitoring/feedback for the student intern | M | 2(67) | | 1(33) | | | | 4.33 | 1.16 |
| | L | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | | | 4.67 | .58 |
| | A & S | 4(50) | 2(25) | 1(12) | | | | 4.43 | .79 |
| Use of evaluative information for program revision and improvement | M | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | | | 3.67 | .58 |
| | L | 1(33) | 1(33) | | 1(33) | | | 3.67 | 1.53 |
| | A & S | 3(38) | 1(12) | 1(12) | | | | 4.49 | .89 |
| Partnership arrangement between the public school and the university | M | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | | | 4.67 | .58 |
| | L | 1(33) | 2(67) | | | | | 4.33 | .58 |
| | A & S | 2(25) | 4(50) | | | | | 4.33 | .52 |
| Financial support for the program | M | 3(100) | | | | | | 5.00 | 0 |
| | L | | 3(100) | | | | | 4.00 | 0 |
| | A & S | 1(12) | 1(12) | 2(25) | | | | 3.25 | .96 |
| Potential for improving the profession of teaching | M | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | | | 4.67 | .58 |
| | L | 2(67) | | 1(33) | | | | 4.33 | 1.16 |
| | A & S | 5(63) | 1(12) | | | | 2(25) | 4.96 | 2.38 |
| Support for the program in the state | M | | 1(33) | 1(33) | 1(33) | | | 3.00 | 1.00 |
| | L | 1(33) | 2(67) | | | | | 4.33 | .58 |
| | A & S | 2(25) | 1(12) | | | | | 4.67 | .58 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Support for the program in the local school systems | | M | 1(33) | | 1(33) | 1(33) | 3.33 | 1.53 |
| | | L | 1(33) | 1(33) | 1(33) | | 4.00 | 1.00 |
| | A & S | | 2(25) | 1(12) | | | 4.67 | .58 |
| Focus on attracting teachers from business, military, and other sectors of society | | M | 3(100 | | | | 5.00 | 0 |
| | | L | 1(33) | 2(67) | | | 4.33 | .58 |
| | A & S | | 2(25) | 3(30) | | | 4.40 | .55 |
| Focus on effective use of Career Level II and III teachers | | M | 3(100) | | | | 5.00 | 0 |
| | | L | 1(33) | 2(67) | | | 4.33 | .57 |
| | A & S | | 1(12) | 1(12) | 1(12) | | 4.00 | 1.00 |
| Overall potential for improving public education | | M | 2(67) | 1(33) | | | 4.67 | .58 |
| | | L | 1(33) | 2(67) | | | 4.33 | .58 |
| | A & S | | 4(50) | 4(38) | | | 4.57 | .54 |